P. F. 54 of 96

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1896-95
~~192~~
(L. R.)

File No. 102 of 94.

Serial Nos. 1 to 6.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to 6.

~~Part~~ B for March 1897.

SUBJECT.

Dispute regarding the alienation of Gandlaveeruvu &c. in the Kistna District.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Letter No 333/1126 of 20th March, 90 submitting proceedings in the petition of Ramachandra Rao appealing against the Deputy Commr's order transferring the Shanbhogi of Gandachinti and other villages of Sidlaghatta taluk, to one Manjundappa.

The Sarkar shanbhogi of all the disputed villages except Gandachinti stood in the register of 1864 in the name of the petitioner Ramachandra Rao and his father; the name of Srenivasa Rao, Hanumantha Rao, Shama Rao and Ramachandra Rao being however also entered therein as Hissedars.

Hanumantha Rao, one of the hissedars, having desired that the shanbhogi of the villages that came to his share, should be ~~entered~~ transferred to his name

and one Kistrappa recognized as his agent, the Deputy Tahsildar ordered the necessary change in the register in his letter dt. 3-5-38. Hanumanta Rao agent ~~died~~ Kistrappa died and his son Subbarayappa was looking after the duties of the shanbhogi, which is however repudiated by Hanumantha Rao on the ground that he did not appoint Subbarayappa as his agent. Subbarayappa resigned on the ground of ~~non-pay~~ nonpayment of dues to him. Hanumantha Rao being too old to manage the business by himself denied both in his petition of the Amildar and in his deposition before him that appellant that one Anemadaya Ranjundappa, who he asserts is the son of his paternal uncle brother and is therefore a Bro 3., should be recognized as the registered shanbhogue of certain of his villages. In his deposition Hanumantha Rao states that the shanbhogs of the villages noted in the margin have been

1. Gan Pachinti,
2. Alagolahalli
3. Kandahalli
4. Chengaravahalli
5. Chittahuva
6. Kengaiachinahalli
7. Chikkagaiachinahalli
8. Kaisaala halli
9. Marlainahalli
10. Kankatakistamma - halli
11. Singadiaravahalli (included in Muchatai village)

Included in Talakere Betta charge and marked as such in the charge

Included in Muchatai

entered against his name in the Survey settlement that Nos. 2 & 3 are independent ~~villages~~ charges, Nos. 4 & 5 are included in the charge of Talakere Betta and is therefore under a separate Shanbhoga, No. 6 is included in Muchatai village, Nos. 7 & 8 are all included in one charge and Nos. 9 & 10 are independent ~~villages~~ charges; that Nos. (9, 7 & 8) and 9 & 10 should be transferred to Manjunadaitai name and that No. 2 & 3 he would look after himself. He also states that he has not to pay anything that he did not appoint him as his agent

~~Subbaraya, who was also examined by the Amildar states that he not to pay for the work done~~

The Amildar in reporting the matter for the Dy. Commr. also stated that Hanumantha Rao has ~~to~~ aid to manage the affairs of the village which he had received for himself.

The Dy. Commr. thereupon asked the Amildar to submit copy of the order nominating Hanumantha Rao as the Shanbhoga of the village, and also to find out if there were any other claimants for the same besides Hanumantha Rao.

On the submission of copy of the extract of Shanbhoga-ship to the Deputy Commissioner, as it appeared to him that there were other claimants for the Shanbhoga, ordered on 7-4-92 that a Gettigai (Proclamation) notice should be issued inviting persons who may be interested to show cause why the grant of Hanumantha Rao should not be granted. The Gettigai notice, as ordered above, was issued on 13-4-92 ordering the appearance of claimants before the Amildar, within 6 months time. In the mean time Hanumantha Rao submitted in his petition dated 22 June 92 that there was no reason to issue the notice as no waradar had any right to interfere in the matter; and on its rejection by the General Asst. Comr he addressed another to the Dy Comr stating that the Shanbhoga of three villages had been assigned to him by a decree passed by the Subordinate Ds Court.

The notice was however served upon one Lakshmana Rao (Hanumantha Rao's brother's son) and

7

Subd for orders —
3/7

The Petition does not seem to have been enquired into at all by the Dy Govt because he did not urge his claims within six months from the publication of a notice. Before the matter is finally brought on for the decision of Govt it seems desirable that the Dy Govt should ascertain the nature of the claim now set up by the Petr and submit a report with his own opinion about it

Orders needed 6/7/86

[illegible]

[illegible] 9/7

8

Recd. 6.35. P.m
21/11/96.

Submitted

The report is the
weapon — ~~[illegible]~~
The grounds on which
B.N. Ramachandra
Rao bases his claim
are no where stated
The Dy Commr report
is silent on this point
& the office note does
not touch it. The genea-
logical table ~~[illegible]~~ shows that
~~[illegible]~~ Ramachandra Rao
is Hanumantha Rao's
father. Kuthubhai's
elder brother Venkata
Rao's son. As such he
seems to be nearer than
~~[illegible]~~ Nanjundappa who has
to trace his connection
through Aswalla Ramappa
father of Kuthubhai —
Ramachandra Rao
is said whenever objec-
tion is raised to the effect
that the name of Hanu-
mantha Rao's daughter
son. Dy Commr does not
say whether this is not the
done — How has he made

It clear that the notice calling upon claimants was served upon Sri Ramachandra Rao.

The case will therefore have to be adjourned for the counsel.

Meanwhile notice should be issued to all parties interested

23/11/96

Fixed for

Sri Srinivasa
26/11/96

Posted to 17th Dec. 1896
Issue notices to all concd
26/11/96

Posted to 28th January 1907
Notices to issue
4/1

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

(2)

1895

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

S.R. 102-94-1

Calcpr Pn
ucf
8/2/95

No. [illegible]

Name of Petitioner. [illegible]

Village. [illegible]

Taluk. [illegible]

District. [illegible]

Date of Grant. [illegible]

Date of Receipt. [illegible]

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. [illegible]

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

As soon as the Council gave the representation the matter of the Governor-in-Council recommend to be of Mr Rossville, you which form as follows: –

Your petition addressed to the Governor – representing that you have been until Barnaville last that Dominion Parliament – claim and other rights for the Legislature – forced to Magistrate, have and that the over-payment in the income depending upon your order in which the amount – having been referred to the Council – Assistant Commissioner to Attorney-General – and he transmitted to them – Carefully – that he has given particular attention – directing the ~~[illegible]~~ facts – you are entitled – upon the report the petition – decision in the matter –

Enquiry has been previously made with Mr Shubbaville – the overseer from the District directing that the Registry of the office should in compliance with legislature from – Dominion Lands within be made in the forwarded Department Department and that books should be taken from them – Now that effect is given to this order –

The petitioner says: –

That the office is vacant by the –

That Magistrate office is not a necessary – does not [illegible] –

That Dominion Lands office is [illegible] no such office – [illegible] office [illegible] family –

That the office is not [illegible] by the [illegible] in accordance with the Act [illegible] – [illegible]

This is wrong. It should be "no longer" not having "no more work"

After Hammersmith Lands & Co

14

Pet 139

8-2-98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

P. R. 108 7-7-2

The accompanying Petition No. 1316 dated 12-7-95 received at the Dewan's Office from [illegible] is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the [illegible]

[illegible]

2 The petition should be returned.

By Order,

Draft Consult order, 7/2

Chief Secretary

BANGALORE, 8-2-1895

18

9/2 11/2

M.G.C.P, Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. No. 12/16
DATE 16-1-96

No 191/16

12 Rs Stamp affd

[illegible]

[illegible] S.S. [illegible] 96

[illegible]

From

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

L. R. 102-94-4

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Minor of the Court of Appeal

20

Re

Petition No: [illegible] dated 12 January 1895 presented by Sidlaghatta Rama Chandra Rao, retired Head Record Keeper Kolar District, appealing against the order of the Commr. Kolar District directing the transfer of the Sub-Registry Office of Gowdachinta and other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, to one Ramyindappa.

2. Docket No: 3381/1126 dated 20th March 1895 from the Dy. Commr. Kolar District submitting the records connected with the case.

Order Minute:- No: 537/P.109 8 11.7.95

The Petitioner's case does not seem to have been carried into by the Dy. Commr. because he did not urge his claims within six months from the publication of the notice. Before the matter is finally brought on for the decision of Govt.

ch

Gen. 31]

Promotion Ref — 2nd Comm — [illegible] to on Recd Note

Ref. (R. 102-94-5)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 2925
189 Ref 243
NOV. 96
DEWAN'S OFFICE

(7)

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To
The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue and General Depts.

Dated 22nd October 1896

Despatched 29th do.

Received

General No. 1035
No. 418

Enclosure No. 1 file

Report on the claims of Petitioner Siddaghatta Ramachandra Rao, retired Revenue Head Record keeper Kolar District regarding the Inamdaghi of Gandlachinta and other villages in the Siddaghatta Taluq.

Hanumanta Rao vs the Shanbhog of Gandlachinta and 5 other villages in the Siddaghatta Taluk.

Being his old & do the duties, he requested that the Shanbhogi might be transferred to his cousin Nanjundappa. This request was granted - vide Dy Commr's order dt 5-1-932 & 8-7-93 - (Papers nos. 7 & 8 of Forest marked R)

Petitioner Ramachandra Rao appealing against this order on the ground that Nanjundappa has no right to the office and that he is the proper Hakdar, as Hanumanta Rao has no male issue. The genealogical tree produced by him is filed as paper no. 17 of the for Forest already referred to.

Hanumanta Rao now states that as Nanjundappa failed to give him maintenance as promised when the 'hak' was transferred to his name, the Shanbhogi may either be re-transferred to him or registered in the name of his daughter's son - (vide his statement dt 9-3-96 - Paper no 22)

The Petitioner Ramachandra Rao states that if the rules allow, the Inamdaghi may be made in the name of Hanumanta Rao's daughter's son, or else it may be allowed to stand in Hanumanta Rao's name (vide paper no 11 of the Forest file) Nanjundappa does not cut to this.

Petitioner Rao's [illegible]

[illegible]

Revision

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Office.

Dated Camp Mysore 22nd October 1896.

No.

To,

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Revenue and General Department.

Sir,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No. 537/P109 dated 11th July 1895 finally orders on the petition of Sidlaghatta Ramachandra Row, retired Revenue Head Record Keeper, Kolar District, regarding the Shanbhogi of Gandlachinte and other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, I have the honor to state that Hanumanta Row, late Shanbhog of the villages in question, the Petitioner and certain others are reported to be concerned.

2. At the request of the said Hanumanta Row, the Shanbhogships of

these

that village which had fallen to his share at a partition of property between himself and his Coparceners was transferred to his uncle and cousin one Nagindas as per this office order noted in the margin* after the publication of a notice inviting claimants who had any objections to the transfer being effected.

3. The Petitioner who evidently kept silent at the time has since come forward and he alleges that he has a preferential claim to the office.

4. Hanumanta Rao has no male issue but he has a daughter's son who is a minor and the Petitioner has no objection to the latter being appointed in preference to Nagindas.

5. Under these circumstances, it seems unnecessary to disturb the present arrangement and I would

Yadi No. 1243 dated 5th January 1893 to the General Commissioner, Salem District.
Do. No. 84 dated 8th July 1893 to - do - , do -

26

Draft for approval.

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:—

L. R. 102-94-6

(1) Petition of appeal No. 1910/A.88 of 94-95, presented by Rama Chandra Rao of Siddaghatta, retired Revenue Dept. Record-keeper, Kolar district, against the Kolar Dy Commr's order transferring the Shanbhogi of Gondlahalli & other villages in the Siddaghatta Taluk to the Anemadagu Kanjundappa.

(2) Letter No. 1645/418 dt 22.10.96, from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar district, reporting on the above.

(1392) P No. 7876/R.A. 54-96 dt 11.3.97/13 Order thereon.

Encs one Ver: file.

Rama Chandra Rao, withdrew the appeal and the others who have appeared viz Lakshman Rao & Kanjundappa son of Ramanna have no

Noted 22/3

objection. This appeal will be struck off.

For Secretary

11/3/97

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District with records.

Draft
Bbn
4/3.